

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 27, 2007, an Election of Species Requirement was issued requiring Applicants to elect one of the following species set forth by the Examiner:

- Species 1 containing Figures 1-4;
- Species 2 containing Figure 5;
- Species 3 containing Figure 6;
- Species 4 containing Figures 7-10;
- Species 5 containing Figures 11 and 12;
- Species 6 containing Figure 13;
- Species 7 containing Figures 14 and 15;
- Species 8 containing Figures 16-19;
- Species 9 containing Figure 20;
- Species 10 containing Figure 21;
- Species 11 containing Figures 22-27; *or*
- Species 12 containing Figures 28-34.

Applicants provisionally elect to pursue prosecution of Species 1, containing Figs. 1-4 with traverse. Applicants have identified claims 1, 2, 15-23 and 26-29 as being generically directed to all species of the present invention, and at least claims 3-6, 10, 12-14, 24, 30 and 31 as directed to species 1 as identified by the Examiner. Therefore, at least claims 1-6, 10, 12-24 and 26-31 should be considered by the Examiner in the present application. Further, Applicants note that all claims subject to restriction and depending from any examined claims are eligible for rejoinder back into the present application upon allowance of the applicable examined claims.

This election is made with traverse. "A requirement for restriction is permissible if there is a patentable difference between the species as claimed and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required." (see MPEP §808.01(a)) In view of the above, Applicants contend that no serious burden has been placed on the Examiner in examining all of the pending claims in the present application, and as a result, all of the requirements as set forth by the MPEP for properly maintaining this restriction have not been fulfilled in this case.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that: (1) all groups of claims, both as originally presented and now as amended, are properly presented in the same application; (2) undue searching is not be required; and (3) all claims should be examined together. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction/election requirement should be withdrawn and an action on the merits of all the claims is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5284.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5284.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: August 22, 2007

By: _____


Elliot L. Frank
Registration No. 56,641

Correspondence Address:
Address Associated With Customer Number:
27123

(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile